

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/805,816	03/13/2001	Mohammad A. Heidaran	07078-030001	6205	
22434	7590 11/19/2004		EXAMINER		
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			AZPURU, CARLOS A		
P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	09/805,816	HEIDARAN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Carlos A. Azpuru	1615			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1,2,10,25 and 26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2,10 and 25 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 26 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
. Mark are 16 V					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 07/19/2004.

The rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over US patent No. 6,586,406, in view of Atkinson et al; the provisional rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over copending application 10/444,640 in view of Atkinson et al; 112, second paragraph; 35 USC 102(e) over Atkinson et al; 35 USC 103(a) over Heidaran et al in view of Atkinson et al; and 35 USC 102(e) over Radice et al are hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 10 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The following is anew rejection of the claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

Art Unit: 1615

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 10 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radice et al in view of Atkinson et al.

Radice et al disclose the use of undifferentiated cells becoming chondrocytes by culturing chondrogenic cells derived from articular cartilage (joints), which then producing an extracellular matrix. Chondrogenic molecules such as BMP-4 may be added. (See 13, line 26 et seq to col. 14, line 58). Therefore, Radice et al disclose all the process steps in a slightly different order, but with the same therapeutic result. The implant is then placed in an area (implanted) so as to correct chondral defects (see Example 10). The instant claims are viewed as an obvious variant of the prior art process as taught by Radice et al which teaches the same steps, but in different order. Those of ordinary skill would expect the same chondrogenic results from the instant process given the teachings of Radice et al. Radice et al. lacks a teaching that the extracellular matrix contains both Type I and Type II collagen.

In a similar chondrogenic composition, Atlkinson et al disclose that the extracellular matrix produced by chondrogenic cells contains both Type I and Type II collagen, As such, the process of claim 1 would have been obvious given

Art Unit: 1615

the teachings of Radice et al, and further, in view of the teachings of Atkinson which teaches that extracellular matrix includes both Type I and Type II collagen. The instant method would have therefore been obvious given the teachings of Radice et al in view of Atkinson et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1615

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Claim 26 is objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos A. Azpuru whose telephone number is (571) 272-0588. The examiner can normally be reached on Tu-Fri, 6:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1615

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ca

CARLOS A. AZPURU PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1500

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVESHY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600